

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended herein. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Farmer (WO 02/39486), hereinafter “Farmer”. Claims 7, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farmer in view of Yung *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,909,974), hereinafter “Yung”.

With respect to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b), Applicants submit that Farmer does not teach all of the features of the claimed invention, as is required under 102(b). For example, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to teach, *inter alia*, a selecting system that dynamically matches the input signature of a first Web service with the specified input of the workflow and the output signature of the first Web service with the input signature of an adjacent Web service and the output signature of a second Web service with the specified output format to ensure that each selected Web service is compatible with the

adjacent Web service in the chain of Web services and the specified input and output formats. See claim 1 and similar language in independent claims 8 and 16.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office alleges that Farmer teaches the dynamic matching capability of a selecting system of the claimed invention by stating “(paragraphs 0062, 0071, 0072, 0073, 0074, 0075, 0076, wherein the workflow of services is dynamically created based on selected data and present components, and a wrapper class is used to integrate services.)” Office Action, pages 3-4, item 4. A careful reading of the cited paragraphs, and Farmer in its entirety, indicates that Farmer is completely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any dynamic matching of input signatures and output signature of adjacent Web services in order to aid in forming a chain of Web services, as in the claimed invention.

In fact, based on the citation, it is unclear to Applicants which elements in Farmer specifically teach the aforementioned features. For example, what element in Gardner teach “**adjacent** Web service”; “**dynamically** matching”; “input **signature**”; “output **signature**”; and, “chain of Web services”. (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully contend the paragraphs cited from Farmer merely disclose data models (figures 11, 7) with mappable objects and the like.

There is no teaching of any type of, *inter alia*, input and output signature matching; adjacent Web services; forming a chain of Web services based on the dynamic matching, and the like. In sum, this cannot amount to a clear teaching and/or suggestion of the aforementioned features.

Thus, Farmer does not teach all of the features found in claim 1. Further, Yung does not remedy these glaring deficiencies in Farmer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 1.

Independent claims 8 and 16 were rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. As a result, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments listed above with respect to claim 1 to independent claims 8 and 16.

With respect to dependent claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-20 Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 8, 2008

/Joseph J. Christian/

Joseph J. Christian  
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044